

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 1 through 7, 12 through 25, and 30 through 50 are pending, with Claims 1, 6, 13, 19, 24, 31, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, and 42 being independent. Claims 1 through 5, 13 through 23, 31 through 37, 39, 40, and 42 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 8 through 11 and 26 through 29 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 6, 24, 38, and 41 have been amended. Claims 43 through 50 have been added.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during a telephonic conversation between Applicant's representative and the Examiner on February 4, 2005. During that conversation, Applicant's representative and the Examiner discussed that Claim 40 had been included in the list of elected claims set forth in the Response filed October 8, 2004, but that Claim 41 instead should have been so listed. The Official Action stated that therefore Claim 40 is non-elected without traverse; however, Applicant respectfully submits that non-election and withdrawal of Claim 40, as was the case with the other withdrawn claims, is with traverse. Favorable consideration is earnestly solicited.

Transmitted herewith are three replacement sheets of formal drawings comprising Figs. 11 through 13 having been labeled as --PRIOR ART--, as required in the Official Action.

Claims 6 through 12, 24 through 30, 38, and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,053,875 (Ishii, et al.). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 6, 24, 38, and 41 variously recite, inter alia, that in a case where an output of the vibration detection device (that includes an angular velocity sensor), which relates to an

amplitude of the vibration before an integral processing, is equal to or larger than a first predetermined value and is smaller than a second predetermined value, limits a signal in accordance with the output by a first limit, and in a case where the output is equal to or larger than the second predetermined value, limits the signal in accordance with the output by a second limit.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that Ishii, et al. fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, inter alia, in Claims 6, 24, 38, and 41. Applicant respectfully notes that Ishii, et al. discloses, e.g., that an acceleration sensor or gyroscope may be used, and the Official Action relies on col. 8, lines 3 through 26 and Fig. 15 which shows deriving a stabilized fluctuation amount against the motion vector. However, Applicant respectfully submits that neither the foregoing nor the remainder of Ishii, et al. provides either a description or a suggestion of at least the above-discussed claimed features including the recitation of --before an integral processing-- as claimed. It is further respectfully submitted that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited document that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the above-discussed claimed features.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Daniel S. Glueck", positioned above a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicant
Daniel S. Glueck
Registration No. 37,838

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

DSG/cmg

DC_MAIN 204068v2